



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,243	08/22/2006	Kiyohito Hiromitsu	8007-1115	6750
<div>466 7590 11/30/2009</div> <div>YOUNG & THOMPSON</div> <div>209 Madison Street</div> <div>Suite 500</div> <div>Alexandria, VA 22314</div>				
EXAMINER				
BLADES, JOHN A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1791				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/30/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DocketingDept@young-thompson.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/590,243

Applicant(s)

HIROMITSU ET AL.

Examiner

JOHN BLADES

Art Unit

1791

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13 and 16-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13 & 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI.08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Interval Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 13 & 16-19 are pending as of the amendment received on 08/13/09.

Response to Amendment

1. This final action is a response to the amendment filed on August 13, 2009. The double patenting rejections are withdrawn in light of the Terminal Disclaimer approved on August 21, 2009. Claims 13 & 16-19 have been amended to make minor adjustments in language. The rejection of claims 13 & 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 13 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchida et al., JP 2001-079857 in view of Hoshino et al., US Patent 6,376,046 for the reasons stated in the previous Action (05/13/09).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see response, "Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)," filed August 13, 2009, with respect to the rejection of claims 13 & 16-19 have been fully considered and are not persuasive.
5. With regard to applicant's argument that the rubber molding member of Tsuchida is not the same as is claimed, examiner refers back to [0016], which states the use of several synthetic rubbers as the molding member, and at no point states that they are vulcanized, thus meeting the current claim.
6. In response to applicant's argument that Hoshino is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992).
7. In this case, the above reference – while not in the immediate field of Applicant's art – does address the issue of permeability adjustments in order to control flow of a retained cleansing material as the basis for the upheld rejection. The issue at hand is that with Tsuchida teaching each of the claimed materials in the instant invention, yet being silent to the degree of porosity in the non-woven material, it is being demonstrated that one of ordinary skill would absolutely adjust any similarly constructed sheet/rubber/sheet with mold conditioning component therein to ensure that its contents are released from the pores in the desired amounts. Hoshino is given as but one of many possible examples wherein the degree of permeability of a sheet is chosen in

order to achieve a desired release. In light of the mold conditioning sheet taught by Tsuchida, it is maintained that one of ordinary skill would have been able to arrive at the claimed porosity of "70% or more" by routine experimentation in the broad realm of "fibrous base sheets."

Terminal Disclaimer

8. The terminal disclaimer filed on 08/13/09 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of any patent granted on Application Number 10/537,358 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded and all double patenting rejections have been withdrawn.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN BLADES whose telephone number is (571)270-7661. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Katarzyna Wyrozebski can be reached on (571)272-1127. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J.B./
Patent Examiner

/Richard Crispino/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791